

Physical Mechanisms for the Variable Spin-down of SGR 1900 + 14

Christopher Thompson¹, Robert C. Duncan², Peter M. Woods^{3,5}, Chryssa Kouveliotou^{4,5},
Mark H. Finger^{4,5}, and Jan van Paradijs^{3,6}

ABSTRACT

We consider the physical implications of the rapid spindown of Soft Gamma Repeater 1900+14 reported by Woods et al. During an 80 day interval between June 1998 and the large outburst on August 27 1998, the mean spin-down rate increased by a factor 2.3, resulting in a positive period offset of $\Delta P/P = 1 \times 10^{-4}$. A radiation-hydrodynamical outflow associated with the August 27th event could impart the required torque, but only if the dipole magnetic field is stronger than $\sim 10^{14}$ G and the outflow lasts longer and/or is more energetic than the observed X-ray flare. A positive period increment is also a natural consequence of a gradual, plastic deformation of the neutron star crust by an intense magnetic field, which forces the neutron superfluid to rotate more slowly than the crust. Sudden unpinning of the neutron vortex lines during the August 27th event would then induce a glitch opposite in sign to those observed in young pulsars, but of a much larger magnitude as a result of the slower rotation.

The change in the persistent X-ray lightcurve following the August 27 event is ascribed to continued particle heating in the active region of that outburst. The enhanced X-ray output can be powered by a steady current flowing through the magnetosphere, induced by the twisting motion of the crust. The long term rate of spindown appears to be accelerated with respect to a simple magnetic dipole torque. Accelerated spindown of a seismically-active magnetar will occur when its persistent output of Alfvén waves and particles exceeds its spindown luminosity. We suggest that SGRs experience some episodes of relative inactivity, with diminished $\dot{P}$, and that such inactive magnetars are observed as Anomalous X-ray Pulsars (AXPs). The reappearance of persistent X-ray emission from SGR 1900+14 within one day of the August 27 event provides strong evidence that the persistent emission is not powered by accretion.

¹Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of North Carolina, Philips Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3255

²Department of Astronomy, University of Texas, RLM 15.308, Austin, TX 78712-1083

³Department of Physics, University of Alabama in Huntsville, Huntsville, AL 35899

⁴Universities Space Research Association

⁵NASA Marshall Space Flight Center, SD50, Huntsville, AL 35812

⁶Astronomical Institute “Anton Pannekoek”, University of Amsterdam, 403 Kruislaan, 1098 SJ Amsterdam, NL

Subject headings: stars: individual (SGR 1900+14) — stars: pulsars — X-rays: bursts

1. Introduction

Woods et al. (1999c; hereafter Paper I) have shown that over the period September 1996 – May 1999, the spin-down history of SGR 1900 + 14 is generally smooth, with an average rate of $6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ s s}^{-1}$. However, during an 80 day interval starting in June 1998 which contains the extremely energetic August 27 flare (Hurley et al. 1999a; Mazets et al. 1999), the average spindown rate of SGR 1900 + 14 increased by a factor ~ 2.3 . The sampling of the period history of SGR 1900 + 14 is insufficient to distinguish between a long-term (i.e. 80 days) increase of the spin-down rate to an enhanced value and a sudden increase (a ‘braking’ glitch) in the spin period connected with the luminous August 27 flare.

In this paper, we investigate several physical processes that may generate a positive period increment of the observed magnitude ($\Delta P/P \sim 10^{-4}$) directly associated with the August 27 flare. We focus on two mechanisms: a particle wind coinciding with the period of hyper-Eddington radiative flux; and an exchange of angular momentum between the crustal neutron superfluid and the rest of the neutron star. We show that both models point to the presence of an intense magnetic field. The change in the persistent pulse profile of SGR 1900+14 following the August 27 outburst is considered, and related to continuing particle output in the active region of the burst. We also consider mechanisms that could drive the (nearly) steady spindown observed in both SGRs and AXPs, as well as departures from uniform spindown.

2. Braking driven by a particle outflow

The radiative flux during the oscillatory tail of the August 27 event decreased from $1 \times 10^{42} (D/10 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg/s}$, with an exponential time constant of $\sim 90 \text{ s}$ (Mazets et al. 1999). The net energy in the tail, radiated in photons of energy $> 15 \text{ keV}$, was $\sim 5 \times 10^{43} (D/10 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg}$. The tail was preceded by much harder, narrow pulse of duration $\sim 0.35 \text{ s}$ and energy $> 7 \times 10^{43} (D/10 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg}$ (Mazets et al. 1999). The very fast rise time of $\sim 10^{-3} \text{ s}$ points convincingly to an energy source internal to the neutron star. Just as in the case of the 1979 March 5 event, several arguments indicate the presence of a magnetic field stronger than 10^{14} G (Thompson & Duncan 1995; hereafter “TD95”). Not only can such a field spin down the star to its observed 5.16 s period (Hurley et al. 1999c; Kouveliotou et al. 1999), but it can power the burst by inducing a large-scale fracture of the neutron star crust. Indeed, only a fraction $\sim 10^{-2} (B_\star/10 B_{\text{QED}})^{-2}$ of the external dipole magnetic energy must be tapped, where $B_{\text{QED}} \equiv 4.4 \times 10^{13} \text{ G}$. This allows for individual SGR sources to emit $\gtrsim 10^2$ such giant flares over their $\sim 10^4 \text{ yr}$ active lifetimes. More generally, *any* energy source that excites internal seismic modes of the neutron star must be

combined with a magnetic field of this strength, if seismic energy is to be transported across the stellar surface at the (minimum) rate observed in the initial spike (cf. Blaes et al. 1989). A field stronger than $1.5 \times 10^{14} (E/6 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg})^{1/2} (\Delta R/10 \text{ km})^{-3/2} [(1 + \Delta R/R_\star)/2]^3 \text{ G}$ is also required to confine the energy radiated in the oscillatory tail (Hurley et al. 1999a), which maintained a very constant temperature even while the radiative flux declined by an order of magnitude (Mazets et al. 1999).

The radiative flux was high enough throughout the August 27 event to advect outward a large amount of baryonic plasma at relativistic speed. Even though one photon polarization mode (the E-mode) has a suppressed scattering cross-section when $B > B_{\text{QED}}$ (Paczynski 1992), splitting of E-mode photons will regenerate the O-mode outside the E-mode scattering photosphere, and ensure that the radiation and matter are hydrodynamically coupled near the stellar surface (TD95). Matter will continue to accumulate further out in the magnetosphere during the burst, but cannot exceed $\tau_{\text{T}} \sim 1$ outside a radius where the energy density of the freely streaming photons exceeds the dipole magnetic energy density,

$$\frac{L_{\text{X}}}{4\pi R_{\text{A}}^2 c} \sim \frac{B_\star^2}{4\pi} \left(\frac{R_{\text{A}}}{R_\star} \right)^{-6}, \quad (1)$$

or equivalently

$$\frac{R_{\text{A}}}{R_\star} \sim \left(\frac{B_\star^2 R_\star^2 c}{L_{\text{X}}} \right)^{1/4} = 280 \left(\frac{B_\star}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\Delta E_{\text{X}}}{10^{44} \text{ erg}} \right)^{-1/4} \left(\frac{\Delta t_{\text{burst}}}{100 \text{ s}} \right)^{1/4}. \quad (2)$$

The radiation pressure acting on the suspended matter will overcome the dipole magnetic pressure at a radius $\leq R_{\text{A}}$; the same is true for the ram pressure of matter streaming relativistically outward along the dipole field lines.

Photons scattering last at radius R_{A} and polar angle θ (or relativistic matter escaping the dipole magnetic field from the same position) will carry a specific angular momentum $\sim \Omega R_{\text{A}}^2 \sin^2 \theta$. The net loss of angular momentum corresponding to an energy release ΔE is

$$I_\star \Delta \Omega \simeq -\frac{\Delta E}{c^2} \Omega R_{\text{A}}^2 \sin^2 \theta. \quad (3)$$

The period increase accumulated on a timescale Δt_{burst} is largest if the outflow is concentrated in the equatorial plane of the star:

$$\frac{\Delta P}{P} \simeq (\Delta E \Delta t_{\text{burst}})^{1/2} \frac{B_\star R_\star^3}{I_\star c^{3/2}} = 8 \times 10^{-6} \left(\frac{\Delta E}{10^{44} \text{ erg}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\Delta t_{\text{burst}}}{100 \text{ s}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{B_\star}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right). \quad (4)$$

The torque is negligible if the dipole field is in the range $B_\star \sim 0.1 B_{\text{QED}}$ typical of ordinary radio pulsars. Even for $B_\star \sim 10 B_{\text{QED}}$ this mechanism can induce $\Delta P/P \sim 1 \times 10^{-4}$ only if the outflow lasts longer than the observed duration of the oscillatory tail. Release of $\sim 10^{44} \text{ erg}$ over $\sim 10^4 \text{ s}$ would suffice; but extending the duration of the outflow to $\sim 10^5 \text{ s}$ would imply

$\dot{P} \sim 1.3 \times 10^{-8}$ one day after the August 27 event, in contradiction with the measured value 200 times smaller. Note also that the short initial spike is expected to impart a negligible torque to the star. This is the basic reason that *persistent* fluxes of Alfvén waves and particles are more effective at spinning down a magnetar than are sudden, short bursts of equal fluence.

One might consider increasing the torque by increasing the inertia of the outflow, so that it moves subrelativistically at the Alfvén surface, at speed V . For a fixed kinetic luminosity, $\dot{E} = (1/2)\dot{M}V^2$, the Alfvén radius scales in proportion to $(V/c)^{1/4}$, and one finds

$$\frac{\Delta P}{P} \simeq 1 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{\Delta E}{10^{44} \text{ erg}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{\Delta t_{\text{burst}}}{100 \text{ s}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right) \left(\frac{V}{0.2c} \right)^{-3/2}. \quad (5)$$

However, the energy needed to lift this material from the surface of the neutron star exceeds $\Delta E = \int \dot{E} dt$ by a factor $\sim 10 (V/0.2 c)^{-2}$ (assuming $GM_{\star}/(R_{\star}c^2) = 0.2$). This scenario therefore requires some fine-tuning, if the flow is to remain subrelativistic far from the neutron star.

Moreover, such a slow outflow is very thick to Thomson scattering and free-free absorption. The Thomson depth along a radial line through the outflow is

$$\tau_{\text{T}}(R_{\text{A}}) = 10 \left(\frac{\Delta E}{10^{44} \text{ erg}} \right)^{5/4} \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\Delta t_{\text{burst}}}{100 \text{ s}} \right)^{-5/4} \left(\frac{V}{c} \right)^{-13/4} \quad (6)$$

at the Alfvén radius. The free-free optical depth is

$$\tau_{\text{ff}} \simeq \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}} \bar{g}_{\text{ff}}}{3^{1/2} (2\pi)^{3/2}} \left(\frac{kT}{m_e c^2} \right)^{-1/2} \frac{\tau_{\text{T}}^2 (hc)^3}{\sigma_{\text{T}} R (kT)^3} f \left(\frac{h\nu}{kT} \right), \quad (7)$$

where

$$f \left(\frac{h\nu}{kT} \right) \equiv \left(\frac{h\nu}{kT} \right)^{-3} (1 - e^{-h\nu/kT}), \quad (8)$$

and $\alpha_{\text{em}} = 1/137$ is the fine structure constant. This becomes

$$\tau_{\text{ff}}(R) = 3 \times 10^{-2} \left(\frac{R}{R_{\text{A}}} \right)^{-5} \left(\frac{\Delta P/P}{10^{-4}} \right)^{5/4} \left(\frac{\Delta E}{10^{44} \text{ erg}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{-16/3} \left(\frac{\Delta t_{\text{burst}}}{100 \text{ s}} \right)^{-5} f \left(\frac{h\nu}{kT} \right). \quad (9)$$

Here, we have substituted the value of V/c needed to generate the observed $\Delta P/P$. Notice that the magnetic dipole field and burst duration enter into τ_{ff} with strong negative powers. The optical depth through a flow along rigid dipole magnetic field lines is $\tau_{\text{T}}(R) = (R/R_{\text{A}})^{-2} \tau_{\text{T}}(R_{\text{A}})$ at constant V .

This calculation indicates that the flow will be degraded to a black body temperature corresponding to an emission radius of $\sim 100 R_{\star} = 1000 \text{ km}$, which is $\sim 1 \text{ keV}$ at a luminosity $\sim 10^4 L_{\text{edd}}$, far below the observed value (Mazets et al. 1999; Feroci et al. 1999). Note, however, that Inan et al. (1999) found evidence for an intense ionizing flux of soft X-rays in the Earth’s ionosphere, coincident with the first second of the August 27th event. They fit this ionization

data with an incident spectrum containing two thermal components, of temperatures 200 and 5 keV, and with the soft component carrying 80% of the energy flux at 5 keV. This model contrasts with the initial spectrum of the August 27 event measured by BeppoSAX, which contained a very hard power-law component ($\nu F_\nu \propto \nu^{1/2}$; Feroci et al. 1999). The effects of pair creation on the ionization rate have yet to be quantified.

The four-pronged profile seen within the later pulses of the August 27 event (Feroci et al. 1999; Mazets et al. 1999) has a plausible interpretation in the magnetar model. The radiation-hydrodynamical outflow originates near the surface of the neutron star, where the opacity of X-ray photons moving across the magnetic field lines is smallest (TD95). This is the case even if the trapped $e^\pm$ fireball that powers the burst extends well beyond the stellar surface. In this model, the pattern of the emergent X-ray flux is a convolution of the multipolar structure of the stellar magnetic field, with the orientation of the trapped fireball. The presence of four X-ray ‘jets’ requires that the trapped fireball connect up with four bundles of magnetic field lines extending to at least a few stellar radii.

3. Braking via the internal exchange of angular momentum

Now let us consider the exchange of angular momentum between the the crustal superfluid neutrons and the rest of the magnetar. Because an SGR or AXP source is slowly rotating, $\Omega_{\text{cr}} \sim 1$, the maximum angular velocity difference $\omega = \Omega_{\text{sf}} - \Omega_{\text{cr}}$ that can be maintained between superfluid and crust is a much larger fraction of Ω_{cr} than it is in an ordinary radio pulsar – and may even exceed it. At the same time, these sources are observed to spin down very rapidly, on a timescale comparable to young radio pulsars such as Crab or Vela. If the rotation of the superfluid were to lag behind the crust in the usual manner hypothesized for glitching radio pulsars, the maximum glitch amplitude would increase in proportion to the spin period (Thompson & Duncan 1996, hereafter TD96; Heyl & Hernquist 1999). One deduces $\Delta P/P \simeq -1 \times 10^{-5}$ by scaling to the largest glitches of the Crab pulsar, and $\Delta P/P \simeq -1 \times 10^{-4}$ by scaling to Vela.

How would a glitch be triggered in a magnetar? A sudden fracture of the crust, driven by a magnetic field stronger than $\sim 10^{14}$ G, induces a horizontal motion at the Alfvén speed $V_A = 1.3 \times 10^7 (B/10 B_{\text{QED}}) (\rho/10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3})^{-1/2} \text{ cm s}^{-1}$, or higher. This exceeds the maximum velocity difference $V_{\text{sf}} - V_{\text{cr}}$ that can be sustained between superfluid and crust, before the neutron vortex lines unpin (e.g. Link, Epstein, & Baym 1993). The internal heat released in a large flare such as the August 27 event is probably comparable to the external X-ray output, if the flare involves a propagating fracture of the neutron star crust. This heat is ~ 100 times the minimum energy of $\sim 10^{42}$ erg that will induce a sudden increase in the rate of thermal vortex creep (Link & Epstein 1993). For both reasons, giant flares from magnetars probably trigger the widespread unpinning of superfluid vortices in the crust and hence large rotational glitches. Magnetically-driven fractures have also been suggested as the trigger for vortex unpinning in ordinary radio pulsars (Thompson & Duncan 1993, hereafter TD93; Ruderman, Zhu, & Chen

1998).

The observation of a period increase associated with the August 27 outburst leads us to re-examine whether the superfluid should, in fact, maintain a faster spin than the crust and charged interior of the star. Transport of superfluid vortices by thermal creep will cause the angular velocity lag ω to relax to its equilibrium value ω_∞ on a timescale

$$t_r^{-1} = \left| \frac{\partial \Omega_{\text{cr}}}{\partial t} \right| \left(\frac{\partial \ln V_{\text{cr}}}{\partial \omega} \right)_{\omega_\infty}, \quad (10)$$

if the creep is driven primarily by spindown (Alpar, Anderson, Pines, & Shaham 1984; Link, Epstein, & Baym 1993). The partial derivative of the creep velocity $\partial V_{\text{cr}}/\partial \omega$ depends mainly on temperature and density. As a result, this relaxation time is expected to be proportional to t/Ω_{cr} at constant temperature. Comparing with a prompt (intermediate) relaxation time of ~ 1 day (~ 1 week) for glitches of the Crab pulsar ($t \simeq 10^3$ yr; Alpar et al. 1996), one infers $t_r \sim 1$ (10) *years* for a magnetar of spin period 6 s and characteristic age $P/\dot{P} = 3000$ yr.

The response of the crust to the evolving magnetic field is expected to be a combination of sudden fractures and plastic deformation. When the temperature of the crust exceeds about ~ 0.1 of the melt temperature, it will deform plastically (Ruderman 1991). One deduces $T \simeq 2.4 \times 10^8 (B/10^2 B_{\text{QED}})^2$ K for magnetars of age $\sim 10^4$ yr (TD96; Heyl & Kulkarni 1998). Plastic deformation is also expected when $B^2/4\pi > \mu$ in the deep crust (TD96). In a circumstance where the magnetic field is transported through the stellar interior on a timescale shorter than the age of the star, departures from corotation between superfluid and crust are primarily due to advection of the superfluid vortices across the stellar surface by the deforming crust, *not* due to spindown. (Recall the principal definition of a magnetar: a neutron star in which magnetism, not rotation, is the dominant source of free energy.) If these deformations occur on a timescale much less than the spindown age, they will control the equilibrium lag between the rotation of the superfluid and crust.

Indeed, the SGR bursts provide clear evidence for deformations on short timescales. More precisely, a large burst such as the August 27 event may be preceded (or followed) by an extended period of slow, plastic deformation. If the superfluid starts near corotation with the crust, this process will take angular momentum out of the superfluid, and force its rotation to lag behind the rest of the star. A glitch triggered by a violent disturbance such as the August 27 event will then cause the neutron star crust to *spin down*.

The angular momentum of the thin shell of crustal superfluid can be expressed simply as

$$J_{\text{sf}} = \frac{\kappa}{2} M_{\text{sf}} R_\star^2 \int_{-1}^1 d(\cos \theta) \cos^2 \theta n_V(\theta), \quad (11)$$

when the cylindrical density $n_V(\theta)$ of neutron vortex lines depends only on angle θ from the axis of rotation. Here $\kappa = h/2m_n$ is the quantum of circulation, and we neglect that the rotational deformation of the star. One observes from this expression that the outward motion of vortex lines reduces J_{sf} , because the weighting factor $\cos^2 \theta$ decreases with distance from the axis of rotation.

The simplest deformation of the neutron star crust, which preserves its mass and volume, involves a rotational twist of a circular patch through an angle $\Delta\phi$. Indeed, the stable stratification of the star (Reisenegger & Goldreich 1992) forces the crust to move horizontally, parallel to the local equipotential surfaces. For this reason, one can neglect horizontal displacements of the crustal material that are compressible in the two non-radial dimensions. The patch has radius $a \ll R_\star$ and is centered at an angle θ from the axis of rotation. The superfluid is assumed initially to corotate with the crust, $\Omega_{\text{sf}} = \Omega_{\text{cr}}$, everywhere within the patch, so that $n_V(\theta) = 2\Omega_{\text{cr}}/\kappa$. As the patch is rotated, the number of vortex lines per unit *surface area* of crust is conserved. A piece of crust that moves from θ_i to θ_f ends up with a vortex density $n_V = (2\Omega_{\text{cr}}/\kappa) \cos \theta_i / \cos \theta_f$. The vortex lines are squeezed together in a piece of the crust that moves away from the rotation axis, and are spread apart if the movement is in the opposite direction. If the vortex density is smoothed out in azimuth following this process, the net decrease in the angular momentum of the superfluid is

$$\frac{\Delta J_{\text{sf}}}{J_{\text{sf}}} = -\frac{3}{4} \left(\frac{a}{R_\star} \right)^4 (1 - \cos \phi) \sin^2 \theta. \quad (12)$$

Here, $J_{\text{sf}} = \frac{2}{3} M_{\text{sf}} \Omega_{\text{cr}} R_\star^2 \simeq 10^{-2} I_\star \Omega_{\text{cr}}$ is the total angular momentum of the crustal superfluid.

A transient, plastic deformation of the crust would induce a measurable spinup of the crust, by forcing the neutron superfluid further from corotation with the crust. Such a gradual glitch would have the same negative sign as in ordinary radio pulsars, but would not necessarily involve any sudden unpinning of the vortex lines. For example, rotation of a patch of radius $a = \frac{1}{3} R_\star$ through an angle $\Delta\phi \sim 1$ radian would cause a period decrease $\Delta P/P = \Delta J_{\text{sf}}/(I_\star - I_{\text{sf}})\Omega_\star = -4 \times 10^{-5}$. A transient spinup of this magnitude may have been observed in the AXP source 1E2259+586 (Baykal & Swank 1996). That excursion from a constant, long term spindown trend can be modelled with a glitch of amplitude $\Delta P/P \simeq -3 \times 10^{-5}$, although the X-ray period observations are generally too sparse to provide a unique fit.

4. The long-term spin-down of SGRs and AXPs

Let us now consider the persistent spindown rate of SGR 1900+14, and its broader implications for the ages and spindown histories of the SGR and AXP sources. Recall that the spindown rate was almost constant at $\dot{P} \simeq 6.1 \times 10^{-11}$ s/s before May 1998, and after August 28 1998 (Paper I). A May 1997 measurement of P revealed a 5% deviation from this trend; and larger variations in the ‘instantaneous’ spindown rate ($\sim 40\%$) were found by RXTE in September 1996 and May/June 1998.

Another important constraint comes from the observed angular position of SGR 1900+14. It lies just outside the edge of the $\sim 10^4$ yr-old supernova remnant G42.8+0.6 (Hurley et al. 1994; Vasisht et al. 1994). A strong parallel can be drawn with SGR 0526-66, which also emitted a giant flare (on 5 March 1979) and is projected to lie inside, but near the edge of, SNR N49 in the Large Magellanic Cloud (Cline et al. 1982). The other known SGRs also have positions coincident with

supernova remnants of comparable ages (Kulkarni & Frail 1993; Kulkarni et al. 1994; Murakami et al. 1994; Woods et al. 1999b; Smith, Bradt, & Levine 1999; Hurley et al. 1999d). It seems very likely that these physical associations are real; so we will hereafter adopt the hypothesis that SGR 1900+14 formed at the center of SNR G42.8+0.6. The implied transverse velocity is

$$V_{\perp} \approx 3400 \left(\frac{D}{7 \text{ kpc}} \right) \left(\frac{t}{10^4 \text{ yr}} \right)^{-1} \text{ km s}^{-1} \quad (13)$$

(Hurley et al. 1996; Vasisht et al. 1996; Kouveliotou et al. 1999). Several mechanisms may impart large recoil velocities to newborn magnetars (Duncan & Thompson 1992, hereafter “DT92”), but this very high speed indicates that an age much less than 1×10^4 yrs is unlikely.

In this context, the short characteristic spindown age $P/2\dot{P} \sim 1400$ yr of SGR 1900+14 gives evidence that the star is currently in a transient phase of accelerated spindown (Kouveliotou et al. 1999). The almost identical spindown age measured for SGR 1806-20 suggests that a similar effect is being observed in that source (Kouveliotou et al. 1998; Table 1). If each SGR undergoes accelerated spindown during a minor fraction $\epsilon_{\text{active}} \sim P/\dot{P}t_{\text{SNR}} \sim 0.25$ of its life, then its true age increases to

$$t = \epsilon_{\text{active}}^{-1} \left(\frac{P}{\dot{P}} \right). \quad (14)$$

4.1. Wind-Aided Spindown

Seismic activity will accelerate the spindown of an isolated neutron star, if the star is slowly rotating and strongly magnetized (Thompson & Blaes 1998, hereafter “TB98”). Fracturing in the crust generates seismic waves which couple directly to magnetospheric Alfvén modes and to the relativistic particles that support the associated currents. The fractures are frequent and low energy ($\sim 10^{35}$ erg) when the magnetic field is forced across the crust by compressive transport in the core (TD96). When the persistent luminosity L_A of waves and particles exceeds the magnetic dipole luminosity L_{MDR} (as calculated from the stellar dipole field and angular velocity), the spindown torque increases by a factor $\sim \sqrt{L_A/L_{\text{MDR}}}$.

This result follows directly from our treatment of hydrodynamic torques in §2. Magnetic stresses force the relativistic wind to co-rotate with the star out to the Alfvén radius R_A , which is determined by substituting L_A for L_X in eq. (2):

$$\frac{R_A}{R_{\star}} = 1.6 \times 10^4 L_{A35}^{-1/4} \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (15)$$

The torque then has the form $I\dot{\Omega} = -\Lambda(L/c^2)R_A^2$, or equivalently

$$\dot{P} = \Lambda \frac{B_{\star} R_{\star}^3}{I_{\star}} \left(\frac{L_A}{c^3} \right)^{1/2} P. \quad (16)$$

Here, Λ is a numerical factor of order unity that depends on the angle between the angular velocity $\mathbf{\Omega}$ and the dipole magnetic moment $\mathbf{m}_\star$. One finds $\Lambda \approx \frac{2}{3}$ by integrating eq. (3) over polar angle, under the assumption that $\mathbf{\Omega}$ and $\mathbf{m}_\star$ are aligned, that the ratio of mass flux to magnetic dipole flux is constant, and that the magnetic field is swept into a radial configuration between the Alfvén radius and the light cylinder. This normalization is ~ 6 times larger than deduced by TB98 for a rotator with $\mathbf{m}_\star$ inclined by 45° with respect to $\mathbf{\Omega}$: they considered the enhanced torque resulting from the sweeping out of magnetic field lines, but not the angular momentum of the outflow itself.

The dipole magnetic field inferred from P and $\dot{P}$ depends on the persistent wind luminosity. Normalizing L_A to the persistent X-ray luminosity, $L_A = L_{A35} \times 10^{35} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, one finds for SGR 1900+14,

$$B_\star = 3 \times 10^{14} L_{A35}^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{2/3} \right)^{-1} I_{45} \left(\frac{\dot{P}}{6 \times 10^{-11}} \right) \left(\frac{P}{5.16 \text{ s}} \right)^{-1} \text{ G.} \quad (17)$$

A very strong magnetic field is needed to channel the flux of Alfvén waves and particles in co-rotation with the star out to a large radius. This extended “lever arm” enhances the magnetic braking torque for a given wind luminosity.

The surface dipole field of SGR 1900+14 is inferred to be less than $B_{\text{QED}} = 4.4 \times 10^{13} \text{ G}$ only if $L_A > 10^{37} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. That is, the wind must be $\sim 30 - 100$ times more luminous than the time-averaged X-ray output of the SGR in either quiescent or bursting modes. Such a large wind luminosity may conflict with observational bounds on the quiescent radio emission of SGR 1900+14 (Vasisht et al. 1994; Frail, Kulkarni, & Bloom 1999). From these considerations alone (which do not involve the additional strong constraints from bursting activity) we find it difficult to reconcile the observed spindown rate of SGR 1900+14 with dipole fields typical of ordinary radio pulsars (as suggested recently by Marsden, Rothschild, & Lingefelter 1999).

Note also that the synchrotron nebula surrounding SGR 1806-20 (Frail & Kulkarni 1993), thought until recently to emanate from the SGR itself and to require a particle source of luminosity $\sim 10^{37} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (TD96), appears instead to be associated with a nearby luminous blue variable star discovered by Van Kerkwijk et al. (1995). The new IPN localization of the SGR source (Hurley et al. 1999b) is displaced by $12''$ from the peak of the radio emission. There is no detected peak in radio emission at the revised location. Since the two SGRs have nearly identical $\dot{P}/P$, we estimate a dipole field $B_\star = 3 \times 10^{14} L_{A35}^{-1/2} \text{ G}$ for SGR 1806-20.

During episodes of wind-aided spindown, the period grows exponentially:

$$P(t) = \mathcal{P} \exp(t/\tau_w), \quad (18)$$

if the luminosity L_A in outflowing Alfvén waves and relativistic particles remains constant. In this equation, $\tau_w \equiv P/\dot{P} = I_\star c^{3/2}/(\Lambda B_\star R_\star^3 L_A^{1/2})$ is a characteristic braking time, and $\mathcal{P}$ is the rotation period at the onset of wind-aided spindown. If L_A has remained unchanged over the lifetime of the star, then $\mathcal{P}$ would be set by the condition that the Alfvén radius sit inside the light cylinder, $\mathcal{P} = 2\pi(B_\star^2 R_\star^6/c^3 L_A)^{1/4} = 1.9 L_{A35}^{-1/4} (B_{\star 14}/3)^{1/2} \text{ s}$ (cf. eq. [2]). (Here, $B_\star = 10^{14} B_{\star 14} \text{ G}$ is the polar magnetic field.)

The narrow distribution of spin periods in the SGR/AXP sources ($P = 5\text{--}12$ s) would be hard to explain if every source underwent this kind of extended exponential spindown; but the possibility cannot be ruled out in any one source. The total age of such a source would be

$$t = (P/\dot{P}) \ln(P/\mathcal{P}) + t(\mathcal{P}), \quad (19)$$

where $t(\mathcal{P})$ is the time required to spin down to period $\mathcal{P}$. Notice that $\dot{P} \propto P$ at constant L_A , as compared with $\dot{P} \propto P^{-1}$ in the case of magnetic dipole radiation (MDR). The net result is to *lengthen* the spindown age deduced from a given set of P and $\dot{P}$, relative to the usual estimate $t_{\text{MDR}} \equiv P/2\dot{P}$ employed for radio pulsars. Note also that $P/\dot{P}$ remains constant throughout episodes of wind-aided spindown.

Applying these results to SGR 1900+14 (eq. [17]), we would infer that wind-aided spindown has been operating for $(P/\dot{P}) \ln(P/\mathcal{P}) = 2700$ yrs (assuming a steady wind of luminosity $L_{A35} = 1$). Its total age, including the age $t(\mathcal{P})$ at the onset of wind-aided braking, would be $2700 + 1300 = 4000$ yrs. (This number only increases to 5600 yrs if L_A increases to 10^{36} erg s $^{-1}$.) This age remains uncomfortably short to allow a physical association with SNR G42.8+0.6: it would imply a transverse recoil velocity $V_{\perp} \approx 0.03 (D/7 \text{ kpc}) c$ [eq. (13)].

The age of SGR 1900+14 can be much longer, and $V_{\perp}$ much smaller, if the accelerated spindown we now observe occurs only *intermittently* (eq. [14]). In the magnetar model, it is plausible that small-scale seismic activity and Alfvén-driven winds are only vigorous during transient episodes, which overlap periods of bursting activity (§4.4 below).

4.2. Connection with Anomalous X-ray Pulsars

If each magnetar undergoes accelerated spindown only for a fraction $\epsilon_{\text{active}} \sim P/\dot{P}t_{\text{SNR}} \sim 0.25$ of its life (eq. [14]), then *the observed SGRs should be outnumbered some $\epsilon_{\text{active}}^{-1} \sim 4$ times by inactive sources that spin down at a rate $\dot{P} \leq P/2t_{\text{SNR}}$.*

The Anomalous X-ray Pulsars (AXPs) have been identified as such inactive SGRs (Duncan & Thompson 1996; TD96; Vasisht & Gotthelf 1997; Kouveliotou et al. 1998). Although harder to find because they do not emit bright bursts, 6 AXPs are already known in our Galaxy, as compared with 3 Galactic SGRs. Table 1 summarizes the spin behavior and age estimates of the two AXP sources that are presently associated with supernova remnants (1E2259+586 and 1E1841-045). Their characteristic ages are larger than those of SGRs 1900+14 and 1806-20.

The characteristic age of 1E2259+586 also appears to be much longer, by about an order of magnitude, than the age of the associated SNR CTB 109. From Wang et al. (1992),

$$t_{\text{SNR}} = 13,000 \left(\frac{E_{\text{SN}}}{0.4 \times 10^{51} \text{ erg}} \right)^{-1/2} \left(\frac{n}{0.13 \text{ cm}^{-3}} \right)^{1/2} \text{ yr}, \quad (20)$$

where E_{SN} is the supernova energy and n is the ISM particle density into which the remnant has expanded. Such a large characteristic age has a few possible explanations in the magnetar model.

First, the source may previously have undergone a period of wind-aided spindown that increased its period to ~ 4 times the value that it would have reached by magnetic dipole braking alone. Indeed, there is marginal evidence for an extended X-ray halo surrounding the source, suggesting recent output of energetic particles (Rho & Petre 1997).

Alternatively, the long characteristic age of 1E2259+586 could be caused by significant decay of the dipole field (TD93 §14.3 and 15.2); or by the alignment of a vacuum magnetic dipole with the axis of rotation (Davis & Goldstein 1970; Michel & Goldwire 1970). Episodes of seismic activity can increase the spindown torque in aligned rotators both by driving the conduction current above the displacement current in the outer magnetosphere, and by carrying off angular momentum in particles and waves. Indeed, the outer boundary of the rigidly corotating magnetosphere, calculated by Melatos (1997) to lie at a radius⁷ $R_{\text{mag}}/R_{\star} = 1 \times 10^3 \gamma^{-1/5} (B_{\star}/10^{14} \text{ G})^{2/5}$, is contained well inside the speed of light cylinder, $R_{\text{lc}}/R_{\star} = 3 \times 10^4 (P/6 \text{ s})$. Here, γ is the bulk Lorentz factor of the streaming charges. There may be some tendency toward an initial alignment of $\mathbf{m}_{\star}$ and $\mathbf{\Omega}$ in rapidly rotating neutron stars that support a large scale α - Ω dynamo. However, as we argue in §4.3, rapid magnetic field decay will generically force $\mathbf{m}_{\star}$ out of alignment with $\mathbf{\Omega}$ and the principal axes of the star.

The remarkable AXP 1841–045 discovered by Vasisht & Gotthelf (1997) is only ~ 2000 yr old, as inferred from the age of the counterpart supernova remnant (Gotthelf & Vasisht 1997). The ratio $t_{\text{MDR}}/t_{\text{SNR}}$ is consistent with unity, in contrast with all other magnetar candidates that have measured spindown and are associated with supernova remnants (Table 1). Of these sources, AXP 1841–045 is also unique in failing to show measurable variations in its spindown rate, X-ray luminosity, or X-ray pulse shape over 10 years (Gotthelf, Vasisht, & Dotani 1999); nor has it emitted any X-ray bursts, or evinced any evidence for a particle outflow through a radio synchrotron halo. These facts reinforce the hypothesis that *departures from simple magnetic dipole breaking are correlated with internal activity in a magnetar*, and suggest that inactive phases can occur early in the life of a magnetar.

4.3. Free Precession in SGRs and AXPs

Magnetic stresses will distort the shape of a magnetar (Melatos 1999). The internal magnetic field generated by a post-collapse α - Ω dynamo is probably dominated by a toroidal component (DT92; TD93). A field stronger than $\sim 100 B_{\text{QED}}$ is transported through the core and deep crust of the neutron star on a timescale short enough for SGR activity (TD96). Such a magnetar is initially *prolate*, with quadrupole moment $\epsilon = 1 \times 10^{-5} (B_{\text{in}}/100 B_{\text{QED}})^2$ (Bonazzola & Gourgoulhon 1996). Rapid field decay may cause the magnetic moment $\mathbf{m}_{\star}$ to rotate away from the long principal axis $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ of the star, irrespective of any initial tendency for these two axes to align. The distortion of the

⁷When the displacement current dominates the conduction current.

rotating figure of the star induced by the rigidity of the crust can be neglected when calculating the spin evolution of the star, as long as $B > 10^{12} (P/1 \text{ s})^{-1} \text{ G}$ (Goldreich 1970).

This hydromagnetic distortion gives rise to free precession on a timescale

$$\tau_{\text{pr}} = \frac{2\pi}{\epsilon\Omega} = 2 \times 10^{-2} \left(\frac{B_{\text{in}}}{100 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{P}{6 \text{ s}} \right) \text{ yr.} \quad (21)$$

Even when the magnetosphere is loaded with plasma, the spindown torque will depend on the angle between $\mathbf{m}_\star$ and the angular velocity $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. Free precession modulates this angle when $\mathbf{m}_\star$ is canted with respect to the long principal axis $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, and so induces a periodic variation in the spindown torque. *Observation of free precession in an SGR or AXP source would provide a direct measure of its total magnetic energy.*

How may free precession be excited? In the case of a rigid vacuum dipole, free precession is damped by the radiation torque if the inclination between $\mathbf{m}_\star$ and $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is less than 55° (Goldreich 1970). At larger inclinations, free precession is excited. In the more realistic case of a plasma-loaded magnetosphere, the rate at which free precession is excited or damped by electromagnetic and particle torques is, unfortunately, not yet known. An additional, *internal* excitation mechanism, which may be particularly effective in an active SGR, involves rapid transport of the field in short, intense bursts. This is a likely consequence of energetic flares like the March 5 or August 27 events, which probably have occurred $\sim 10^2$ times over the lifetimes of these sources. If the principal axes of the star are rearranged on a timescale less than τ_{pr} , then $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ will not have time to realign with the principal axes and precession is excited. Only if the magnetic field is transported on a timescale longer than τ_{pr} , will $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ adiabatically track the principal axes.

An interesting alternative suggestion (Melatos 1999) is that forced radiative precession in a magnetar drives the bumpy spindown of the AXP sources 1E2259+586 and 1E1048-593 on a timescale of years. When $\mathbf{m}_\star$ is not aligned with $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$, the asymmetric inertia of the corotating magnetic field induces a torque along $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \times \mathbf{m}_\star$ (Davis & Goldstein 1970). This near-field torque acts on a timescale τ_{nf} that is $(\Omega R/c)$ times the electromagnetic braking time:

$$\tau_{\text{nf}} \simeq 0.3 \left(\frac{B_\star}{10 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{P}{6 \text{ s}} \right) \text{ yr.} \quad (22)$$

As long as $\tau_{\text{nf}} < \tau_{\text{pr}}$, this near-field torque drives an anharmonic wobble of the neutron star; in particular, Melatos (1999) considers the case where $\tau_{\text{nf}} \sim \tau_{\text{pr}}$. However, inspection of equations (21) and (22) suggests instead that $\tau_{\text{pr}} \ll \tau_{\text{nf}}$, because the magnetic energy is dominated by an internal toroidal component. In this case, the near-field torque averages to zero (Goldreich 1970). Note also that this mechanism is predicated on an evacuated inner magnetosphere, although the nonthermal spectra of SGRs and AXPs indicate that this may not be a good approximation (Thompson 1999). The model has the virtue of making clear predictions of the future rotational evolution of the AXPs, which will be tested in coming years.

4.4. Almost Constant Long-term Spindown

We now address the near-uniformity of the long-term spindown rate of SGR 1900+14, before and after the August 27 outburst (Woods et al. 1999a; Marsden, Rothschild & Lingenfelter 1999; Paper I). It provides an important clue to any mechanism causing acceleration of the rate of spindown.

There appears to be no measurable correlation between bursting activity and long-term spindown rate (Paper I). This observation is consistent with the occurrence of short, energetic bursts: the period increment caused by the release of a fixed amount of energy is smaller for outbursts of short duration Δt , scaling as $(\Delta t)^{1/2}$ (eq. [4]). The implied constancy of the magnetic dipole moment is also consistent with the energetic output of the August 27 burst: only $\simeq 0.01 (E_{\text{Aug 27}}/10^{44} \text{ erg}) (B_{\star}/10 B_{\text{QED}})^{-2}$ of the exterior dipole energy need be expended to power the burst. Indeed, if the burst is powered by a large-scale magnetic instability, one infers, from this argument alone, that the dipole field cannot be much smaller than $10 B_{\text{QED}}$.

An additional clue comes from the bursting history of SGR 1806-20. In that source, the cumulative burst fluence grows with time, in a piecewise linear manner (Palmer 1999). This indicates that there exist many quasi-independent active regions in the star, each of which expends a fraction $\sim 10^{-5}$ of the total energy budget. The continuous output of waves and particles from the star is therefore the cumulative effect of many smaller regions. Nonetheless, the long term uniformity of $\dot{P}$ requires the rate of persistent seismic activity in the crust to remain carefully regulated over a period of years (or longer), even though the bursting activity is much more intermittent.

Persistent seismic activity is excited in a magnetar by the *compressive* mode of ambipolar diffusion of the magnetic field through the core (TD96). The resulting compressive transport of the magnetic field through the crust requires frequent, low energy ($E \sim 10^{35} \text{ erg}$) fractures of the crust induced by the Hall term in the electrical conductivity. The total energy released in magnetospheric particles has the same magnitude as the heat conducted out from the core to the stellar surface. The (orthogonal) rotational model of ambipolar diffusion will shear the crust. It can induce much larger fractures that create optically thick regions of hot $e^{\pm}$ plasma trapped by the stellar magnetic field (TD95). The strong intermittency of SGR burst activity appears to be closely tied to the energy distribution of SGR bursts, which is weighted toward the largest events (Cheng et al. 1996). This suggests that the rate of low-energy Hall fracturing will more uniform, being modulated by longer term variations in the rate of ambipolar diffusion through the neutron star core.

Nonetheless, the modest variability observed in the short term measurements of $\dot{P}$ (Paper I) must be accounted for. Stochastic fluctuations in the rate of small-scale crustal fractures provide a plausible mechanism. An alternative source of *periodic*, short-term variability involves free precession in a magnetar whose dipole axis is tilted from the long principal axis (§4.3).

Although angular momentum exchange with the crustal superfluid is a promising mechanism to account for the $\Delta P/P \sim 10^{-4}$ period shift associated with the August 27 event, it is less likely to dominate long-term variations in the spindown rate. An order of magnitude increase in the spindown rate driven such exchange could persist only for a small fraction $\sim 10^{-1} I_{\text{sf}}/I_{\star} \sim 10^{-3}$ of the star’s life. Moreover, a gradual deformation of the neutron star crust by magnetic stresses will remove angular momentum from the superfluid and decrease the rate of spindown.

5. Changes in the Persistent X-ray Flux and Lightcurve

The persistent X-ray lightcurve of SGR 1900+14 measured following the August 27 event (Kouveliotou et al. 1999; Murakami et al. 1999) appears dramatically different from the pulse profile measured earlier: indeed, the profile measured following the burst activity of May/June 1998 (Kouveliotou et al. 1999) is identical to that measured in April 1998 (Hurley et al. 1999c) and September 1996 (Marsden, Rothschild & Lingenfelter 1999). Not only did the pulse-averaged luminosity increase by a factor 2.3 between the 1998 April 30 and 1998 September 17/18 ASCA observations (Hurley et al. 1999c; Murakami et al. 1999), but the lightcurve also simplified into a single prominent pulse, from a multi-pulsed profile before the August 27 flare. The brighter, simplified lightcurve is suggestive of enhanced dissipation in the active region of the outburst (Kouveliotou et al. 1999). We now discuss the implications of this observation for the dissipative mechanism that generates the persistent X-rays, taking into account the additional constraints provided by the period history of SGR 1900+14.

5.1. Magnetic Field Decay

The X-ray output of a magnetar can be divided into two components (TD96): thermal conduction to the surface, driven by heating in the core and inner crust; and external Comptonization and particle bombardment powered by persistent seismic activity in the star. Both mechanisms naturally generate $\sim 10^{35}$ erg s $^{-1}$ in continuous output. The appearance of a thermal pulse at the surface of the neutron star will be delayed with respect to a deep fracture or plastic rearrangement of the neutron star crust, by the thermal conduction time of ~ 1 year (e.g. Van Riper, Epstein, & Miller 1991). By contrast, external heating will vary simultaneously with seismic activity in the star. We have previously argued that if 1E2259+586 is a magnetar, then the coordinated rise and fall of its *two* X-ray pulses (as observed by Ginga; Iwasawa et al. 1992) requires the thermal component of the X-ray emission to be powered, in part, by particle bombardment of two connected magnetic poles (TD96, §4.2).

Neither internal heating, nor variability in the rate of persistent seismic activity, appears able to provide a consistent explanation for the variable lightcurve of SGR 1900+14. Deposition of $\sim 10^{44}$ erg of thermal energy in the deep crust, of which a fraction $1 - \epsilon$ is lost to neutrino

radiation, will lead to an increased surface X-ray output of $\sim 3 \times 10^{35} (\epsilon/0.1) \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. If, in addition, the heated deposited per unit mass is constant with depth z in the crust, then the heat per unit area scales as $\sim z^4$; whereas the thermal conduction time varies weakly with z at densities above neutron drip (Van Riper et al. 1991). The outward heat flux should, as a result, grow monotonically. This conflicts with the appearance of the new pulse profile of SGR 1900+14 no later than one day after the August 27 event. By the same token, a significant increase in persistent seismic activity – at the rate needed to power the increased persistent luminosity $L_X \sim 1.5 \times 10^{35} (D/7 \text{ kpc})^2 \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (Murakami et al. 1999) – would induce a measurable change in the spindown rate that was not observed.

The observations require instead a steady particle source that is confined to the inner magnetosphere. A large-scale deformation of the crust of the neutron star, which likely occurred during the August 27 outburst, must involve a horizontal twisting motion (§3). If this motion were driven by *internal* magnetic stresses,⁸ then the external magnetic field lines connected to the rotating patch would be twisted with respect to their opposite footpoints (which we assume to remain fixed in position). We suppose that the twist angle decreases smoothly from a value $\theta_{\max}$ at the center of the patch to its boundary at radius a . This means that a component of the twist will remain even after magnetic reconnection eliminates any tangential discontinuities in the external magnetic field resulting from the motion. The current carried by the twisted bundle of magnetic field is

$$I \simeq \frac{\theta_{\max} \Phi c}{8\pi L}, \quad (23)$$

where $\Phi = \pi a^2 B_*$ is the magnetic flux carried by the bundle and L is its length.

The surface of an AXP or SGR is hot enough ($T \sim 0.5 \text{ keV}$) to feed this current via thermionic emission of $Z < 12$ ions from one end of the flux bundle, and electrons from the other end. In magnetic fields stronger than $Z^3 \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 B_{\text{QED}} = 4 \times 10^{13} (Z/26)^3 \text{ G}$, even iron is able to form long molecular chains. The cohesion energy per atom is

$$\frac{\Delta E}{Z^3 \times 13.6 \text{ eV}} = 1.52 \left(\frac{B}{Z^3 \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 B_{\text{QED}}} \right)^{0.37} - \frac{7}{24} \left[\ln \left(\frac{B}{Z^3 \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 B_{\text{QED}}} \right) \right]^2. \quad (24)$$

In this expression, the first term is the binding energy per atom in the chain (Neuhauser, Koonin, & Langanke 1987; Lai, Salpeter, & Shapiro 1992), from which we subtract the binding energy of an isolated atom (Lieb, Solovej, & Yngvason, 1992). Thermionic emission of ions is effective above a surface temperature

$$T_{\text{thermionic}} \simeq \frac{\Delta E}{30}. \quad (25)$$

⁸A sudden unwinding of an external magnetic field could release enough energy to power the March 5 (or August 27) event, but it was argued in TD95 that the timescale $\sim R_*/c \sim 10^{-4} \text{ s}$ would be far too short to explain the width of the initial $\sim 0.2 \text{ s}$ hard spike. A pulse broadened by a heavy matter loading would suffer strong adiabatic losses and carry a much greater kinetic energy than is observed in γ -rays. Shearing of the external magnetic field requires internal motions that will, in themselves, trigger a large outburst by fracturing the crust.

Substituting $B = 10 B_{\text{QED}} = 4.4 \times 10^{14}$ G, one finds that $T_{\text{thermionic}}$ remains well below 0.5 keV for $Z < 12$, but grows rapidly at higher Z . Thus, the surface of a magnetar should be an effective thermionic emitter for a wide range of surface compositions.

We can now estimate the energy dissipated by the current flow. The kinetic energy carried by ions of charge Z and mass A is

$$L_{\text{ion}} = \left(\frac{A}{Z}\right) \frac{Im_p \phi}{e} = 3 \times 10^{35} \frac{\theta_{\text{max}} A}{Z} \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10 B_{\text{QED}}}\right) \left(\frac{L}{R_{\star}}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{a}{0.5 \text{ km}}\right)^2 \text{ erg s}^{-1}. \quad (26)$$

Here, $\phi \simeq g_{\star} R_{\star} = GM_{\star}/R_{\star}$ is the gravitational potential that the charges have to climb along the tube, and we assume $M_{\star} = 1.4 M_{\odot}$, $R_{\star} = 10$ km. Note that the particle flow estimated here is large enough to break up heavy nuclei even where the outflowing current has a positive sign: electrons returning from the opposite magnetic footpoint are energetic enough for electron-induced spallation to be effective (e.g. Schaeffer, Reeves, & Orland 1982).

On what timescale will this twist decay? Each charge accumulates a potential energy $Am_p g z$ a height z above the surface of the neutron star. Equating this energy with the electrostatic energy released along the magnetic field, one requires a longitudinal electric field $E = Am_p g / Ze$. The corresponding electrical conductivity is

$$\sigma = \frac{I}{\pi a^2 E} = \left(\frac{Z \theta_{\text{max}}}{8 \pi A}\right) \frac{e B c}{m_p g_{\star} L}, \quad (27)$$

and the ohmic decay time is

$$t_{\text{ohmic}} = \frac{4 \pi \sigma L^2}{c^2} = \left(\frac{Z \theta_{\text{max}}}{2 A}\right) \frac{e B_{\star} L}{m_p g_{\star} c} = 300 \left(\frac{Z \theta_{\text{max}}}{A}\right) \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10 B_{\text{QED}}}\right) \left(\frac{L}{10 \text{ km}}\right) \text{ yr}. \quad (28)$$

This timescale agrees with that obtained by dividing the persistent luminosity L_{ion} into the available energy of the twisted magnetic field. Further twisting of the field lines would prolong or shorten the lifetime of the current flow.

A static twist in the surface magnetic field will not produce a measurable increase in the torque because the current flow is contained well inside the Alfvén radius (eq. [15]). The particles that carry the current lose their energy to Compton scattering and surface impact on a timescale $\sim R_{\star}/c$ or shorter. By contrast, a persistent flux of low amplitude Alfvén waves into the magnetosphere causes the wave intensity to build up, until the wave luminosity transported beyond the Alfvén radius balances the continuous output of the neutron star (TB98). Thus, the particle flow induced by a localized twist in the magnetic field lines supplements the particle output associated with persistent seismic activity occurring over the larger volume of the star.

5.2. Evidence Against Persistent Accretion

Direct evidence that the persistent X-ray output of SGR 1900+14 is *not* powered by accretion comes from measurements one day after the August 27 outburst (Kouveliotou et al. 1999). The

increase in persistent L_X is not consistent with a constant spindown torque, unless there was a substantial change in the angular pattern of the emergent X-ray flux following the burst. In addition, the radiative momentum deposited by that outburst on a surrounding accretion disk would more than suffice to expel the disk material, out to a considerable distance from the neutron star. In such a circumstance, the time to re-establish the accretion flow onto the neutron star, via inward viscous diffusion from the inner boundary R_{in} of the remnant disk, would greatly exceed one day.⁹ Let us consider this point in more detail.

The accretion rate (assumed steady and independent of radius before the outburst) is related to the surface mass density $\Sigma(R)$ of the hypothetical disk via

$$\dot{M} = \frac{2\pi R^2 \Sigma(R)}{t_{\text{visc}}(R)}. \quad (29)$$

The viscous timescale is, as usual,

$$t_{\text{visc}}(R) \simeq \alpha_{\text{SS}}^{-1} \left(\frac{H(R)}{R} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{R^3}{GM_\star} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (30)$$

where $H(R)$ is the half-thickness of the disk at radius R and $\alpha_{\text{SS}} < 1$ is the viscosity coefficient (Shakura & Sunyaev 1973). Balancing the radiative momentum incident on a solid angle $\sim 2\pi(2H/R)$ against the momentum $\sim \pi\Sigma(R)R^2(2GM_\star/R)^{1/2}$ of the disk material moving at the escape speed, and equating the persistent X-ray luminosity L_X with $GM_\star\dot{M}/R_\star$, one finds

$$t_{\text{visc}} = \frac{E_{\text{Aug 27}}}{L_X} \left(\frac{2GM_\star}{R_\star c^2} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{R_{\text{in}}}{R_\star} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{H(R_{\text{in}})}{R_{\text{in}}} \right). \quad (31)$$

The most important factor in this expression is the ratio of burst energy to persistent X-ray luminosity, $E_{\text{Aug 27}}/L_X = 30 (E_{\text{Aug 27}}/10^{44} \text{ erg}) (L_X/10^{35} \text{ erg s}^{-1})^{-1} \text{ yr}$. The timescale is long as the result of the enormous energy of the August 27 flare, and the relatively weak persistent X-ray flux preceding it. It is interesting to compare with Type II X-ray bursts from the Rapid Burster and GRO J1744-28, which are observed to be followed by dips in the persistent emission (Lubin et al. 1992; Kommers et al. 1997). These bursts, which certainly are powered by accretion, involve energies $\sim 10^4$ times smaller and a persistent source luminosity that is $10^2 - 10^3$ times higher. Indeed, the dips in the persistent emission following the Type II bursts last for only 100-200 s, consistent with the above formula.

Now let us evaluate eq. (31) in more detail. At a fixed $\dot{M}$, the surface mass density of the disk increases with decreasing α_{SS} , and so a conservative upper bound on t_{visc} is obtained by choosing α_{SS} to be small. (Note that eq. (31) depends implicitly on α_{SS} only through the factor of

⁹This estimate of the viscous timescale is conservative for two reasons: First, if the binding energy of the disk material were balanced with the incident radiative energy, the inner boundary of the remnant disk would like at even larger radius. Second, the central X-ray source may puff up the disk, which increases τ_{visc} (eq. [31]).

$R_{\text{in}}^{1/2} \propto \alpha_{\text{SS}}^{1/2}$.) For the observed parameters $E_{\text{Aug 27}} \simeq 10^{44}$ erg (Mazets et al. 1999) and $L_X = 10^{35}$ erg s $^{-1}$ (before the August 27 outburst; Hurley et al. 1999a), one finds $R_{\text{in}} = 1 \times 10^{10}$ cm when $\alpha_{\text{SS}} = 0.01$. The corresponding thickness of the gas-pressure dominated disk is (Novikov & Thorne 1973) $H(R_{\text{in}})/R_{\text{in}} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-3}$. The timescale over which the persistent X-ray flux would be re-established is extremely long, $t_{\text{visc}} \simeq 10$ yr.

One final note on disk accretion. There is no observational evidence for a binary companion to any SGR or AXP (Kouveliotou 1999). Because of its large recoil velocity (eq. [13]), SGR 1900+14 almost certainly could not remain bound in a binary system. A similar argument applies to the other giant flare source, SGR 0526–66 (DT92). Thus, any accretion onto SGR 1900 +14 would have to come from a fossil disk. To remain bound, the initial radius of such a disk must be less than $GM_{\star}/V_{\text{rec}}^2 \sim 10^4$ km, for stellar recoil velocity $V_{\text{rec}} \sim (3/2)^{1/2}V_{\perp}$ [eq. (13)]. The behavior of a passively spreading remnant disk appears inconsistent with the measured spin evolution of the AXP and SGR sources (Li 1999).

A trigger involving sudden accretion of an unbound planetesimal (Colgate and Petschek 1981) is not consistent with the log-normal distribution of waiting periods between bursts (Hurley et al. 1994) in SGR 1806-20. An internal energy source is also indicated by the power-law distribution of burst energies, with index $dN/dE \sim E^{-1.6}$ similar to the Gutenberg-Richter law for earthquakes (Cheng et al. 1996). In addition, the mass of the accreted planetesimals must exceed $\sim 1/30$ times the mass of the Earth’s Moon in the case of the March 5 and August 27 events. It is very difficult to understand how the accretion of a baryon-rich object could induce a fireball as clean as the initial spike of these giant flares (TD95, §7.3.1). When $B_{\star} \ll 10^{14}$ G, only a tiny fraction $(B_{\star}/B_E)^2$ of the hydrostatic released would be converted to magnetic energy; here, $B_E \sim 10^{14}$ G is the minimum field needed to directly power the outburst.

6. Conclusions

The observation (Paper I) of a rapid spindown associated with the August 27 event, $\Delta P/P = +1 \times 10^{-4}$, provides an important clue to the nature of SGR 1900+14. We have described two mechanisms that could induce such a rapid loss of angular momentum from the crust and charged interior of the star. The torque imparted by a relativistic outflow during the August 27 event is proportional to $B_{\star}$, but falls short by an order of magnitude even if $B_{\star} \sim 10 B_{\text{QED}} = 4.4 \times 10^{14}$ G. Only if SGR 1900+14 released an additional $\sim 10^{44}$ erg for an extended period $\sim 10^4$ s immediately following the August 27 outburst would the loss of angular momentum be sufficient. (The integrated torque increases with the duration Δt of the outflow as $(\Delta t)^{1/2}$; eq. [4].)

The alternative model, which we favor, involves a glitch driven by the violent disruption of the August 27 event. The unpinned neutron superfluid will absorb angular momentum if it starts out spinning more slowly than the rest of the star – the opposite of the situation encountered in

glitching radio pulsars. We have argued that a slowly spinning neutron superfluid is the natural consequence of magnetic stresses acting on the neutron star crust. A gradual, plastic deformation of the crust during the years preceding the recent onset of bursting activity in SGR 1900+14 would move the superfluid out of co-rotation with the rest of the star, and slow its rotation. The magnitude of the August 27 glitch can be crudely estimated by scaling to the largest glitches of young, active pulsars with similar spindown ages and internal temperatures. Depending on the object considered, one deduces $|\Delta P|/P \sim 10^{-5} - 10^{-4}$.

This model for the August 27 period increment has interesting implications for the longer-term spindown history of the Soft Gamma Repeaters and Anomalous X-ray Pulsars. It suggests that these objects can potentially glitch, with or without associated bursts, and that P will suddenly shift *upward*, rather than downward as in radio pulsar glitches. By the same token, an accelerated rate of plastic deformation within a patch of the neutron star crust will force the superfluid further out of co-rotation and induce a transient (but potentially resolvable) *spin-up* of the crust (TD96). The magnitude of such a ‘plastic spin-up’ event (eq. [12]), could approach that inferred for the August 27 event, but with the usual (negative) sign observed in radio pulsar glitches. Indeed, RXTE spin measurements provide evidence for a rapid spin-up of the AXP source 1E2259+586 (Baykal & Swank 1996), to the tune of $\Delta P/P = -3 \times 10^{-5}$. Transient variations in the persistent X-ray flux of the AXP 1E2259+586, which were not associated with any large outbursts, also require transient plastic deformations of the neutron star crust (TD96).

The rapid spindown rate of SGR 1900+14 during the past few years, $\dot{P} = 6 \times 10^{-11}$ s/s, indicates that this SGR is a transient phase of *accelerated spindown*, with stronger braking torques than would be produced by simple magnetic dipole radiation (Kouveliotou et al. 1999). Such accelerated spindown can be driven by magnetically-induced seismic activity, with small-scale fractures powering a steady relativistic outflow of magnetic vibrations and particles. This outflow, when channeled by the dipole magnetic field, carries away the star’s angular momentum. A very strong field, $B_\star \gg B_{\text{QED}}$, is required to give a sufficiently large “lever arm” to the outflow.

Further evidence for episodic accelerated spindown comes from the two AXPs that are directly associated with supernova remnants: 1E2259+586 and 1E1841-045 (§4.2). The characteristic ages $P/2\dot{P}$ of these stars are *longer* than the ages of the associated supernova remnant, and also longer than the characteristic ages of the SGRs. This suggests that the AXPs are magnetars observed during phases of seismic inactivity.

The constancy of the long-term spindown rate before and after the bursts and giant flare of 1998 (Woods et al. 1999a; Marsden, Rothschild & Lingenfelter 1999; Paper I) gives evidence that the spindown rate correlates only weakly with bursting activity. It is easy to understand why short, intense bursts are not effective at spinning down a magnetar: the Alfvén radius (the length of the “lever arm”) decreases as the flux of Alfvén waves and particles increases.

A persistent output of waves and particles could be driven by the compressive mode of ambipolar diffusion in the liquid neutron star interior (TD96). As the magnetic field is forced

through the crust, the Hall term in the electrical conductivity induces many frequent, small fractures ($\Delta E \sim 10^{35}$ erg). By contrast, large fractures of the crust are driven by shear stresses that involve the orthogonal (rotational) mode of ambipolar diffusion. The greater intermittency of bursting activity is a direct consequence of the dominance of the total burst fluence by the largest bursts (Cheng et al. 1996).

Forced radiative precession could cause a short-term modulation of the spindown rate in a magnetar (Melatos 1999), but this requires an evacuated magnetosphere that may not be consistent with the observed non-thermal spectra of the SGR and AXP sources (Thompson 1999). We have argued that transport of the neutron star’s magnetic field will deform the principal axes of the star and induce *free* precession. The resulting modulation of the spindown torque has an even shorter timescale (eq. [21]), and is potentially detectable.

A twist in the exterior magnetic field induced by a large scale fracture of the crust will force a persistent thermionic current through the magnetosphere (§5). The resulting steady output in particles would explain the factor ~ 2.3 increase in the persistent X-ray flux of SGR 1900+14 immediately following the August 27 event (Murakami et al. 1999) if $B_\star \sim 10B_{\text{QED}}$ and the twist is through ~ 1 radian. In this model, the simplification of the lightcurve – into a single large pulse – is due to concentrated particle heating at the site of the August 27 event.

We conclude by emphasizing the diagnostic potential of coordinated measurements of spectrum, flux, bursting behavior and period derivative. When considered together, they constrain not only the internal mechanism driving the accelerated spindown of an SGR source, but also the mechanism powering its persistent X-ray output. For example: an increase in surface X-ray flux will be delayed by ~ 1 year with respect to an episode of deep heating (e.g. Van Riper et al. 1991); whereas a shearing and twisting of the external magnetic field of the neutron star will drive a simultaneous increase in the rate of external particle heating (TD96). The magnetar model offers a promising framework in which to interpret these observations.

We acknowledge support from NASA grant NAG 5-3100 and the Alfred P. Sloan foundation (C.T.); NASA grant NAG5-8381 and Texas Advanced Research Project grant ARP-028 (R.C.D.); the cooperative agreement NCC 8-65 (P.M.W.); and NASA grants NAG5-3674 and NAG5-7808 (J.vP.). C.T. thanks A. Alpar and M. Ruderman for conversations.

REFERENCES

- Alpar, M.A., Anderson, P.W., Pines, D., & Shaham J. 1984, ApJ 276, 325
- Alpar, M.A., Chau, H.F., Cheng, K.S., & Pines D. 1996, ApJ, 459, 706
- Baykal, A. & Swank, J.H. 1996, ApJ, 460, 470
- Blaes, O., Blandford, R., Goldreich, P., & Madau, P. 1989, ApJ, 343, 829

- Bonazzola, S. & Gourgoulhon, E. 1996, *A& A*, 312, 675
- Cheng, B., Epstein, R.I., Guyer, R.A., & Young, C. 1996, *Nature*, 382, 518
- Cline, T., et al. 1982, *ApJ*, 255, L45
- Colgate, S.A. & Petchek, A.G. 1981, *ApJ*, 248, 771
- Davis, L. & Goldstein, M. 1970 *ApJ*, 159, L81
- Duncan, R. & Thompson, C. 1992, *ApJ*, 392, L9 (DT92)
- Duncan R.C. & Thompson C. 1996, in *AIP Conf. Proc.* 366, *High Velocity Neutron Stars and Gamma Ray Bursts*, ed. R.E. Rothschild & R.E. Lingenfelter (Woodbury: AIP), 111
- Feroci, M., Frontera, F., Costa, E., Amati, L., Tavani, M., Rapisarda, M., & Orlandini, M. 1999, *ApJ*, 515, L9
- Frail, D.A., Kulkarni, S.R., & Bloom, J.S. 1999, *Nature*, 398, 127
- Goldreich, P. 1970, *ApJ*, 160 L11
- Gotthelf, E.V. & Vasisht, G. 1997, *ApJ*, 486, L133
- Gotthelf, E.V., Vasisht, G., & Dotani, T. 1999, *ApJ Letters*, in press ([astro-ph 9906122](#))
- Heyl, J.S. & Hernquist, L. 1999, *MNRAS*, 304, L37
- Heyl, J.S. & Kulkarni, S.R. 1998, *ApJ*, 506, L61
- Hurley, K., Sommer, M., Kouveliotou, C., Fishman, G., Meegan, C., Cline, T., Boer, M., & Niel, M. 1994, *ApJ*, 431, L31
- Hurley, K., Kouveliotou, C., Fishman, G., Meegan, C., Briggs, M., Van Paradijs, J., Cline, T., Kommers, J., Lewin, W., Boer, M., & Niel, M. 1996, *ApJ*, 463, L13
- Hurley, K., Cline, T., Mazets, E., Barthelmy, S., Butterworth, P., Marshall, F., Palmer, D., Aptekar, R., Golenetskii, S., Il'inski, V., Frederiks, D., McTiernan, J., Gold, R., & Trombka, J. 1999a, *Nature*, 397, 41
- Hurley, K., Kouveliotou, C., Woods, P., Cline, T., Butterworth, P., Mazets, E., Golenetski, S., & Frederics, D. 1999b, *ApJ*, 510, L107
- Hurley, K., Li, P., Kouveliotou, C., Murakami, T., Ando, M., Strohmayer, T., Van Paradijs, J., Vrba, F., Luginbuhl, C., Yoshida, A., & Smith, I. 1999c, *ApJ*, 510, L111
- Hurley, K., Kouveliotou, C., Woods, P., Mazets, E., Golenetskii, S., Frederiks, D.D., Cline, T., & Van Paradijs J. 1999d, *ApJ*, 519, L143
- Inan, U.S., Lehtinen, N.G., Lev-Tov, S.J., Johnson, M.P., Bell, T.F., & Hurley, K. 1999, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, in press
- Iwasawa, K., Koyama, K., & Halpern, J.P. 1992, *PASJ*, 44 9
- Kommers, J.M., Fox, D.W., Lewin, W.H.G., Rutledge, R.E., Van Paradijs, J., & Kouveliotou, C. 1997, *ApJ*, 482, L53

- Kouveliotou, C., Dieters, S., Strohmayer, T., van Paradijs, J., Fishman, G.J., Meegan, C.A., Hurley, K., Kommers, J., Smith, I., Frail, D. & Murakami, T. 1998, *Nature*, 393, 235
- Kouveliotou, C. 1999, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci*, 96, 5351
- Kouveliotou, C., Strohmayer, T., Hurley, K., van Paradijs, J., Finger, M.H., Dieters, S., Woods, P., Thompson, C. & Duncan, R.C. 1999, *ApJ*, 510, L115
- Kulkarni, S., & Frail, D. 1993, *Nature*, 365, 33
- Kulkarni, S., Frail, D.A., Kassim, N.E., Murakami, T., & Vasisht, G. 1994, *Nature*, 368, 129
- Lai, D., Salpeter, E.E., & Shapiro, S.L. 1992, *Phys. Rev. A*, 45, 4832
- Li, X.-D. 1999, *ApJ*, in press ([astro-ph 9903190](#))
- Lieb, E.H., Solovej, J.P., & Yngvason, J. 1992, *ApJ*, 69, 749
- Link, B., Epstein, R.I., & Baym, G. 1993, *ApJ*, 403, 285
- Link, B. & Epstein, R.I. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 844
- Lubin, L.M., Lewin, W.H.G., Rutledge, R.E., Van Paradijs, J., Van der Klis, M., & Stella, L. 1992, *MNRAS*, 258, 759
- Mazets, E.P., Cline, T., Aptekar, R.L., Butterworth, P., Frederiks, D.D., Golenetskii, S.V., Il'inskii, V.N., & Pal'shin, V.D. 1999, *Astronomy Letters*, in press
- Marsden, D., Rothschild, R.E., & Lingenfelter, R.E. 1999, *ApJ*, 520 L107
- Melatos, A. 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, 1049
- Melatos, A. 1999, *ApJ*, 519, L77
- Mereghetti, S., Israel, G.L., & Stella, L. 1998, *MNRAS* 296, 689
- Michel, F.C. & Goldwire, H.C. 1970, *Ap Lett*, 5, 21
- Murakami, T., Tanaka, Y. Kulkarni, S.R., Ogasaka, Y. Sonobe, T., Ogawara, Y., Aoki, T., & Yoshida, A. 1994, *Nature*, 368, 127
- Murakami, T., Kubo, S., Shibazaki, N., Takeshima, T., Yoshida, A., & Kawai, N. 1999, *ApJ*, 510, L119
- Neuhauser, D., Koonin, S.E., & Langanke, K. 1987, *Phys. Rev. A*, 36, 4163
- Novikov, I.D. & Thorne, K.S. 1973, in *Black Holes*, C. DeWitt & B. DeWitt, eds., (Gordon and Breach; New York)
- Paczyński, B. 1992, *Acta Astron.* 42, 145
- Palmer, D.M. 1999, *ApJ*, 512, L113
- Reisenegger, A. & Goldreich, P. 1992, *ApJ*, 395, 240
- Rho, J. & Petre, R. 1997, *ApJ*, 484, 828
- Ruderman, M. 1991, *ApJ*, 382, 576

- Ruderman, M.A., Zhu, T., & Chen, K. 1998, *ApJ*, 492, 267
- Schaeffer, R., Reeves, H., & Orland, H. 1982, *ApJ*, 254, 688
- Shakura, N.I. & Sunyaev, R.A. 1973, *A&A*, 24, 337
- Smith, D.A., Bradt, H.V., & Levine, A.M. 1999, *ApJ*, 519, L147
- Thompson, C. 1997, in *Gamma-Ray Bursts*, proceedings of the Fourth Huntsville Symposium, eds. C.A. Meegan, R.D. Preece, and T.M. Koshut (AIP: New York), p. 944
- Thompson, C. 1999, in preparation
- Thompson, C. & Duncan, R. 1993, *ApJ*, 408, 194-217 (TD93)
- Thompson, C. & Duncan, R. 1995, *MNRAS*, 275, 255-300 (TD95)
- Thompson, C. & Duncan, R. 1996, *ApJ*, 473, 322-342 (TD96)
- Thompson, C. & Blaes, O. 1998, *Phys Rev D*, 57, 3219 (TB98)
- Van Kerkwijk, M.H., Kulkarni, S.R., Matthews, K., & Neugebauer, G. 1995, *ApJ*, 444, L33
- Van Riper, K.A., Epstein, R.I., & Miller, G.S. 1991, *ApJ*, 381, L47
- Vasisht, G. & Gotthelf, E.V. 1997, *ApJ*, 486, L129
- Vasisht, G., Kulkarni, S.R., Frail, D.A., & Greiner, J. 1994, *ApJ*, 431, L35
- Wang, Z., Qu, Q., Luo, D., McCray, R., & MacLow, M. 1992, *ApJ*, 388, 127
- Woods, P.M., Kouveliotou, C., van Paradijs, J., Finger, M.H., & Thompson, C. 1999a, *ApJ*, 518, L00
- Woods, P.M., Kouveliotou, C., van Paradijs, J., Hurley, K., Kippen, R.M., Finger, M.H., Briggs, M.S., Dieters, S. & Fishman, G.J. 1999b, *ApJ*, 519, L139
- Woods, P.M., Kouveliotou, C., van Paradijs, J., Finger, M.H., Thompson, C., Duncan, R.C., Hurley, K., Strohmayer, T., Swank, J., & Murakami, T. 1999c, *ApJ*, in press (*astro-ph* 9907173)

Table 1. SGRs and AXPs with Measured Spin-down Rates and Associations with Supernova Remnants

Source	Period s	Period Derivative s s ⁻¹	t _{MDR} yr	t _{SNR} yr	t _{MDR} /t _{SNR}
SGR 1806 – 20 ^a	7.47	8.3×10^{-11}	1430	$\sim 10^4$	~ 0.1
SGR 1900 + 14 ^b	5.16	6.1×10^{-11}	1340	$\sim 10^4$	~ 0.1
AXP 1E2259 + 586 ^c	6.98	5.0×10^{-13}	220,000	$\sim 13,000$	~ 10
AXP 1E1841 – 045 ^d	11.8	4.13×10^{-11}	4570	~ 2000	~ 2.3

^aKouveliotou et al. 1998

^bThis work and references herein

^cMereghetti, Israel, & Stella 1998 and references therein
Wang et al. 1992

^dVasisht & Gotthelf 1997
Gotthelf & Vasisht 1997
Gotthelf, Vasisht, & Dotani 1999